

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

NIKISHA PUGH, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TERRY PRICE, ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 3:22-CV-2477-X-BN

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. [Doc. No. 4]. Specifically, the Magistrate Judge concluded that Plaintiffs’ complaint failed to allege a basis for finding diversity or federal-question jurisdiction.

Plaintiffs present two responses. First, they ask “why this case does not meet jurisdiction?”¹ But that query does nothing to meet Plaintiffs’ burden of establishing the Court’s jurisdiction. Second, they note that Price’s first name is “Teran,” not “Terry.”² But Price’s first name has no impact on the Magistrate Judge’s jurisdictional analysis.

¹ Doc. No. 7 at 1.

² Doc. No. 5 at 1.

Accordingly, the Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, **DENIES** Pugh's motion to amend [Doc. No. 5], and **FINDS AS MOOT** Pugh's request for service [Doc. No. 6].

IT IS SO ORDERED this 20th day of February, 2023.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brantley Starr", written over a horizontal line.

BRANTLEY STARR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE